

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/941,858

Applicant(s)

MESTHA ET AL.

Examiner

Felix E Suarez

Art Unit

2857

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Felix E Suarez.

(3) Marc Hoff.

(2) Adam Neff.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 June 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Mestha.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Neff suggested that the Mestha patent did not teach the use of a reference database. Mr Neff also suggested that Mestha lacked a teaching at placing greater importance on data in the neighborhood of each reflectance value. The Examiner will study the reference and conduct further search upon the filing of a formal response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


MARC S. HOFF

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2857

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required